



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/212,726	12/15/98	SCHUEGRAF	K M122-1098

021567 MMC1/0125
WELLS ST JOHN ROBERTS GREGORY AND MATKIN
SUITE 1300
601 W FIRST AVENUE
SPOKANE WA 99201-3828

EXAMINER

KIELIN,E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2813

9

DATE MAILED: 01/25/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/212,726

Applicant(s)

Schuegraf

Examiner

Erik Kielin

Group Art Unit
2813



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Erik Kielin

(3) _____

(2) Bernard Berman 37,279

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jan 23, 2001

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 39-48

Identification of prior art discussed:

Sukharev US 5,710,049; Zabicky et al., "Gas-Phase Hydrolysis of Tetraethyl Orthosilicate (TEOS)"

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

(1) Agreed that the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph could be overcome by including language in the claims to indicate rate differences relative to the presence or absence of water or hydrogen peroxide.

(2) Agreed that the prior art rejections over Sukharev might possibly be overcome by overcoming the enablement rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Charles 2. Bowers Jr.

Charles Bowers

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.
Supervisory Patent Examiner